

1
2
3
4 Matthew Sutton, OSB# 92479
5 Attorneys at Law
6 205 Crater Lake Avenue
7 Medford, OR 97504
8 Telephone (541) 772-8050
msutt@uci.net

9 Attorney for Capital Financial Services, LLC

10
11 IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
12 DISTRICT OF OREGON

13
14 In Re:) Case No. 07-62298-fra13
15 CYNTHIA LEE ODIN,)
16) **OBJECTION TO POST CONFIRMATION**
17) **AMENDMENT OF PLAN**
18 Debtor)
19

20 Capital Financial Services, LLC. ("Objector"), makes the following objections in
21 response to the Notice of Post-Confirmation Modification of Plan dated April 29,
22 2010:

23 1. Objector is a fully secured creditor who provided purchase money financing for
24 Debtor's vehicle, a 2005 Sunrise. As such, Objector is entitled to full payment on its
25 claim pursuant to the "hanging paragraph" of BAPCPA, 11 USC §1325(a).
26 Accordingly, the plan must provide for Objector's claim to be paid in full. §18.59A,
Bankruptcy Law, p. 18-47, OSB CLE (2007).

27 2. Objector objected to Debtor's previous proposed modified plan in March of
28 2008 since it did not provide for full payment of Objector's claim. As a result, Debtor
29 agreed to revise the plan to provide full payment by increasing payments to Objector

30 Page 1 -OBJECTION TO POST CONFIRMATION AMENDMENT OF PLAN

31
32 MATTHEW SUTTON
33 Attorney at Law
34 205 Crater Lake Avenue, Medford, OR 97504
35 Telephone: (541) 772-8050 • Fax: (541) 772-8077

once an additional \$1,629.59 in attorney fees were paid off. But now that the attorney fees have been paid in full, Debtor is proposing a further modification that would pay Objector nothing and simply surrender the vehicle. This sequence of events amounts to an “end run” around the requirement to pay secured creditors concurrently with administrative expenses. In re Sanchez, 384 BR 574 (Bankr D Or 2008) (citing §507(a)(2); §1326(b)(1) (holding that administrative expense claimants are entitled to be paid concurrently with, rather than before, non-administrative claims)

3. Since the Debtor has now had the use of the vehicle for approximately 3 years during the bankruptcy, it has surely depreciated in value significantly. As such, although objector could proceed to sell the surrendered vehicle, a deficiency would likely result. However, Debtor's latest proposed revision does not provide for any payment to Objector for the deficiency. As such, it does not provide for full payment of Objector and is therefore not a valid plan. 11 USC §1325(a); §18.59A, Bankruptcy Law, p. 18-47, OSB CLE (2007).

4. If the resulting deficiency is deemed an unsecured claim, the modified plan provides that it will receive 0% of that claim. If it is treated as secured, the plan is silent on how Debtor intends to pay the deficiency.

5. The Trustee has a motion to dismiss pending which should be granted.

Dated: May 4, 2010.

By: /s/ Matthew Sutton
Matthew Sutton, OSB# 92479
Attorney for Capital Financial